

The meeting began with a welcome and with introductions. Pat Downs, Chris Gross and Josh Hassell from Moore Engineering, Inc. facilitated the meeting. A list of the attendees is attached to the original notes.

Today's plan is to continue the review of alternatives carried forward from meeting #5 - looking at the alternative/concept information with a detailed review and discussion. The remaining alternatives include impoundments; channelization (with impoundment); wetland creation/restoration; cropland conversion to grassland/Best Management Practices and tile management. The range of alternatives from the beginning included: 1) Land use changes/reduce flood volumes; 2) Protection-avoidance; 3) Increase conveyance-capacities; and 4) Increase temporary flood storage.

The remaining alternatives determined by the project team at Meeting # 5 will be discussed. Some alternatives were left as neutral from the last meeting to continue their review. Some alternatives would need specific locations from the project team. If alternatives are recommended for further study - 1) Impoundments - if yes - need to select locations; 2) Channelization - if yes - narrow down locations or present a new location - upstream or downstream of an impoundment; 3) Wetland Restoration/Creation - if yes - specific locations or the team could set a general watershed goal; 4) Cropland BMPs or conversion to grassland - if impoundments are selected, plans must exist on 50% of the area upstream of the site to be eligible for federal funding. BMP's can also help meet specific watershed projects with additional conservation practices utilized by landowners. A general goal on new BMP acres could also be set or recommended.

Resource Concerns must be ranked into high, medium or low. The project team reviewed the public comments and moved salinity and alkali soils/soil health (due to wet conditions in many parts of the watershed) up to a high concern and agreed on the resource concern list. Each impoundment alternative will be reviewed and remember that impoundments were considered a primary alternative. Sites can be modified, optimized or moved within the general location. There are land rights to consider in the project areas. Each landowner has many options to choose from to meet their particular situation and needs,

It was pointed out that an additional drainage area has been added to the watershed. New modeling was done based on comments from landowners and board managers during a previous meeting. Upon further review of the watershed, during the processing of the LiDAR data, (completed in 2010-11) a culvert was missed through a driveway. This culvert has been added to the model and the analysis indicated that approximately 4 square miles of drainage area was added to the watershed and then to models.

Each of the remaining alternatives from meeting #5 were then reviewed and discussed. Site No. 3 - dismiss; Site No 6 - keep; Site No. 7 - keep; Site No. 10 - keep; Site No. 12 - keep; Site Nos. 13, 16, 17, 19- dismissed. Impoundment modeling results both individual and combination were reviewed. The channelization sites were reviewed and none were retained. The sites were dismissed because they did not adequately meet the watershed plan purpose and need.

Some tool box items to help attain goals were again discussed; - Wetland Restoration/Creation (10% wetland restored) which decreases runoff and enhances environment (possible mitigation); cropland BMPs/Grassland Restoration (50% upstream of impoundments required for federal

funding) this would increase infiltration, decrease soil losses; Channelization (upstream of an impoundment site) increases capacity downstream of a site or increase conveyance to a site and culvert sizing can aid in the conveyance to an impoundment because there is an adequate outlet.

There are approximately 8,443 acres of total wetlands in the Shortfoot Creek Watershed. Approximately 573 acres are designated as partially ditched or drained. The Wetland Created/Restored alternatives included Site Nos. 25, 26, 27, and 28 and none were dismissed and the team remain neutral on these sites. Site No. 30 - Ag Levee - was dismissed as there is no appropriate location for such levees.

The next steps are to conduct one more project team meeting. Following the next meeting, landowner meetings will be held with landowners where the proposed project areas are located. After landowner meetings, Engineers will begin initial design information; geotech analysis; detailed environmental review; modeling; land discussions; economic analysis (both benefit and cost); final watershed plan; permits and funding.

Next meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 12 at 1:00 p.m. in Geneseo.